

### Columbia County Planning Commission Proposed Agenda for May 19, 2016 at 6:00 P.M. **Evans Government Center Auditorium** Evans, Georgia

Planning Commissioners:

Countywide - Jim Cox District 1 – Chris Noah District 3 – Richard Henderson, Sr. Vice-Chairman – Donald Skinner District 4 - Dewey Galeas A. CALL TO ORDER.......Chairman Cox 1. May 5, 2016 a. Rezoning None b. Variance 1. None a. Conceptual Plan 1. None b. Preliminary Plat 1. None c. Final Plat 1. Ridges at Riverwood, Phase 5, located off of Franklin Ridge Road, zoned PUD (Planned Unit

- Development), 39 lots, 36.99 +/- acres, Tax Map 058 Parcel 134B, Commission District 3. Staff Assignment Nayna Mistry.
- d. Plan Revisions
  - 1. RZ16-05-02, Minor PUD (Planned Unit Development) Revision, Tax Map 051 003Q, 12.53+/acres, located at 2030 Baker Place Road. Commission District 3. Staff Assignment Danielle Bolte.
- e. Public Hearings

- 1. **RZ16-05-01**, **(Public Hearing)**, Revise the Master Sign Plan, Tax Map 061 Parcel 030T, 22.97+/- acres, located at the intersection of Lewiston Road and William few Parkway. *Commission District 3.* **Staff Assignment Danielle Bolte**.
- VA16-05-03, (Public Hearing), Variance to Section 90-135 Signs, Tax Map 068 Parcel 1670, 1.93+/- acres, located at 4019 Gateway Blvd. Commission District 4. Staff Assignment Will Butler.
- 3. VA16-05-04, (Public Hearing), Variance to Section 90-135 Signs, Tax Map 072 Parcel 045F, 8.63+/- acres, located at 4355 Washington Road. Commission District 1. Staff Assignment Danielle Bolte.
- f. Text Amendments
  - 1. TA16-04-08 (Public Hearing) Section 90-147, Use Provisions. Staff Assignment, Andrew Strickland.
  - 2. TA16-04-02 (Public Hearing) Section 90-50, List of Permitted Uses. Staff Assignment, Andrew Strickland.
  - 3. TA16-04-03 (Public Hearing) Section 90-97, List of Permitted Uses. Staff Assignment, Andrew Strickland.
- g. Items Added (which need immediate action or have not gone before Committee)
  - 1. None

The next scheduled Planning Commission meeting is June 2, 2016 at 6:00 P.M. in the Auditorium of Building A at the Evans Government Center.



# FINAL PLAT

RIDGES AT RIVERWOOD
Phase 5

**Property Information** 

Ridges at Riverwood, Phase 5
Off Franklin Ridge Road
Tax Map 058 Parcel 134B
36.99 acres
39
PUD (Planned Unit Development)
H & C Surveying
District 3 (Richardson)
Approval

## **Summary and Recommendation**

Riverwood Land, LLC, seeks final plat approval for 39 residential lots on 36.99 acres located off Franklin Ridge Road. The property is zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development). The Board of Commissioners approved the PUD zoning in December 2005 with a subsequent revision in March 2016. The preliminary plat was approved on August 6, 2015.

The average residential lot size is 23,075 square-feet with a minimum lot size of 13,311 square-feet. The lots will have a 30-foot front setback from the right of way. Each lot will have 5-foot side setbacks and 10-foot rear setbacks.

Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Winterton Street and Pretoria Drive; the developer will be responsible for installing all sidewalks around open space areas prior to the expiration of the warranty period, with sidewalks in front of building lots installed as the homes are built. 14.3 acres of open space are provided in this phase.

The submitted final plat appears to substantially comply with the approved preliminary plat.



FILE: RZ16-05-02

Minor PUD Revision

Property Information	
Tax Map/Parcel ID	Tax Map 051 Parcel 003Q
Address/Location	2030 Baker Place Road
Acreage (+/-)	12.53 +/- acres
Current Zoning	PUD (Planned Unit Development)
Existing Use	Vacant
Request	Minor PUD Revision
Commission District	District 3 (Richardson)
Recommendation	Approval

## Summary and Recommendation

Owner Pollard Land Company and applicant Coel Development Company, Inc., request a minor revision to the current PUD (Planned Unit Development) zoning for Tax Map 051 Parcel 003Q, 12.53 +/- acres located at 2030 Baker Place Road, to revise the layout of the townhomes and single family lots in Section II of Kelarie.

The property in question is located on the north side of Baker Place Road near its intersection with William Few Parkway and is currently zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development). Surrounding properties are zoned R-A (Residential Agriculture) and PUD.

The proposed revision is to the layout for Section II of the development, located at the northeast corner of the development closest to the intersection of William Few Parkway and Baker Place Road. This section is intended to accommodate 4 townhome lots and 44 single family residential lots around a loop road, with open space provided within the loop.

The approved site plan called for the townhome lots to be grouped together along the northern arm of the loop, with the single family lots around the remaining sides. The revision proposes interspersing the townhome lots along the straight sections of the loop road, with single family radial lots located in the curves between the townhome units. The proposed revision does not increase the total number of units or the density of the development and meets the intent of PUD zoning to encourage a mix of lot sizes and innovative site design within the development.

Additional minor changes to the layout include revising the cul-de-sac from its original offset design to a more traditional cul-de-sac, creating slightly smaller lots on this cul-de-sac with a larger buffer to their rear, and providing additional buffering along the secondary entrance to the development at Tralee Court.



FILE: RZ16-05-02

Minor PUD Revision

Staff recommends **approval** of the minor revision to the current PUD (Planned Unit Development) zoning for Tax Map 051 Parcel 003Q, 12.53 +/- acres located at 2030 Baker Place Road, to revise the layout of the townhomes and single family lots in Section II of Kelarie.

## Interdepartmental Review

A copy of this staff report, including a list of all recommended zoning conditions, is sent to the applicant and owner of the property in question prior to the public hearing.

Since the site plan for Kelarie, Section II, had already been submitted to plan review, this request was not sent out for interdepartmental comments.

### Comments:

### Planning:

- 1. All conditions approved as part of the original rezoning and previous revisions will still apply.
- 2. Conditions supplement but do not eliminate other code requirements which pertain to site development. No variances from Code have been expressed or implied. In case of conflicts, the more restrictive item shall prevail over the less restrictive item.

## Criteria for Evaluation of Rezoning Proposal

1. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property.

The proposed revision is suitable for the development and for the intent of the PUD zoning.

2. Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.

The proposal will not adversely impact adjacent or nearby properties.

3. Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

The property does have a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.

- 4. Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities or schools.
  - The proposal will not cause an excessive burden on existing facilities.
- 5. If the local government has an adopted land use plan, whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the land use plan.

The adopted future land use map identifies this as an area for future neighborhood development.

A Community of Pride...A County of Vision...Endless Opportunity



FILE: RZ16-05-02

Minor PUD Revision

6. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approval or disapproval of the zoning proposal.

Staff is not aware of any at this time.

7. Whether the proposal reflects a reasonable balance between the promotion of health, safety, and welfare against the right to unrestricted use of property.

The proposal meets this test.





FILE: RZ16-05-01

Master Sign Plan Revision

Property Information	
Tax Map/Parcel ID	Tax Map 061 Parcel 030T
Address/Location	William Few Parkway and Lewiston Road
Acreage (+/-)	24.97 +/- acres
Current Zoning	C-2 (General Commercial)
Existing Use	Vacant
Request	Revise Master Sign Plan
Commission District	District 3 (Richardson)
Recommendation	Disapproval

## **Summary and Recommendation**

Owner The Kroger Company and applicant John Roegge request the revision of the master sign plan adopted in 2015 for multiple parcels (Tax Map 061 Parcels 030C, 030I, and 030P and Tax Map 061A Parcels 021-029 and 031), 30.89 +/- acres located at the intersection of William Few Parkway and Lewiston Road and currently zoned C-2 (General Commercial). The revision will apply only to the main Kroger parcel, Tax Map 061 Parcel 030T, 24.97 +/- acres.

The property in question is located in the northwest corner of the intersection of William Few Parkway and Lewiston Road. The parcels were rezoned to C-2 in 2014 (RZ14-10-07) with a condition that a master sign plan be adopted for the parcels.

The properties lie partially within the GSO (General Sign Overlay) district, and partially within the CSO (Community Sign Overlay) district. Specifically, the parcel on the south side of William Few Parkway and the southeast corner of the parcel for the new Kroger lie within the GSO, and the remainder of the parcels lie within the CSO.

Additionally, the Board of Commissioners applied the following signage-related conditions to the properties when they were rezoned:

- (6) An application for a master sign plan must be submitted to and approved by Columbia County prior to the issuance of any sign permits.
- (7) All signs must be monument-based with materials and colors consistent with the overall development. The maximum height of all individual planned center signs shall be 30 feet. The maximum height of all individual freestanding signs shall be eight (8) feet.
- (8) Billboards are prohibited.



FILE: RZ16-05-01

Master Sign Plan Revision

A master sign plan was adopted for this development in December of 2015, which included three freestanding signs for Kroger – one large planned center sign on the corner of Lewiston Road and William Few Parkway and two eight foot monument signs at the entrances off of William Few Parkway and Lewiston Road. The style for all of the proposed signs was similar, with a stone base, brick framing and a peaked decorative top. The total height was eight feet at the peak, with just over 30.5 square feet of sign face. The approved design for the freestanding signs on the outparcels matched the proposed signs for Kroger.

The proposed revision is to the design of the smaller monument signs for the Kroger parcel only. The proposed revision reduces the overall height of the sign to 7 feet and reduces the sign face area to just under 24 square feet, but removes the decorative peaked top in favor of a flat top and eliminates the masonry base in favor of brick extending all the way to the ground. The original masonry base was slightly wider than the sign structure, framing the sign face, while the brick will extend in an unbroken line to the ground. Although the revised sign measures smaller than the proposed sign, the proposed design utilizes more straight lines and fewer decorative elements that make the sign appear larger, starker, and more intrusive than the approved design.

Additionally, this sign design was adopted as part of a master sign plan that included not only the Kroger parcel but the surrounding parcels as well in order to create a cohesive feel for the commercial development on this corner. The design for the outparcel monument signs matches that of the originally approved monument signs for Kroger, with the masonry base and peaked top. The parcel across William Few Parkway, under development for McDonald's, has already had their monument sign approved following the previously approved design. Revising the design for only the Kroger parcel diminishes the effect of the master sign plan by diluting the character of the development and taking away from the sense of cohesiveness that was the intent of the conditions.

Staff therefore recommends **disapproval** of the request to revise the master sign plan the main Kroger parcel, Tax Map 061 Parcel 030T, 24.97 +/- acres, located at the intersection of William Few Parkway and Lewiston Road and currently zoned C-2 (General Commercial).

FILE: RZ16-05-01

Master Sign Plan Revision

## Interdepartmental Review

A copy of this staff report, including a list of all recommended zoning conditions, is sent to the applicant and owner of the property in question prior to the public hearing.

### Comments:

### **Building Standards:**

Ensure all applicable codes provided by the International Building Code and the National Electrical Code are met.

#### Fire Marshal:

To comply with applicable fire codes.

### Planning:

- 1. Conditions supplement but do not eliminate other code requirements which pertain to site development. No variances from Code have been expressed or implied. In case of conflicts, the more restrictive item shall prevail over the less restrictive item.
- 2. Consideration should be given to identifying appropriate locations for planned center signs on the outparcels as well as the Kroger parcel to reduce the number of signs to be installed in the area.

## Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal

The criteria below are typically used to evaluate variance requests. Although this request is processed as a rezoning as part of the master sign plan, the request has more in common with a variance than a typical rezoning, and therefore the variance criteria were used to evaluate this application.

- 1. There are special circumstances or conditions unique to the property that do not generally apply to the district.
  - The only unique circumstance on this property is that it is subject to a master sign plan that includes multiple parcels at this intersection. The proposed revision to the signs for this one parcel does not meet the intent of the adoption of the master sign plan for this area.
- 2. The special circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the applicant of any reasonable use of his land. Mere loss in value shall not justify a variance. There must be a deprivation of beneficial use of land.
  - The master sign plan does not deprive the applicant of reasonable use of the land. There are no additional special circumstances on this property that would require the revised sign design to be approved.
- 3. Topographical or other conditions peculiar and particular to the site are such that strict adherence to the requirements of this chapter would cause the owner unnecessary



FILE: RZ16-05-01

Master Sign Plan Revision

hardship, and would not carry out the intent of this chapter, and that there is no feasible alternative to remedy the situation.

The applicant has submitted that the landscaping required on the site could block the signs with their currently approved design. The landscaping requirement is not particular to this site; additional landscaping width was required at the time of rezoning, but the height of the landscaping is likely to be similar to that used throughout the County. Other properties in the County and even within this development have met the sign requirements without unnecessary hardship; therefore requiring this property to meet their master sign plan as approved should not create unnecessary hardship for the owner.

4. If granted, the variance shall be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this chapter, and shall not be injurious to the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

The proposal to revise the master sign plan for only a portion of the development is not in keeping with the intent of adopting a master sign plan.

5. In reviewing an application for a variance, the burden of showing that the variance should be recommended and/or granted shall be upon the person applying for the variance.

In staff's opinion, the applicant has not provided enough justification for the variance.

- 6. When recommending a variance, the planning commission, or board of commissioners, when granting a variance, may establish reasonable conditions concerning the use of the property, and may establish an expiration date for such variances.
  So noted.
- 7. Any variance recommended and/or authorized is to be set forth in writing in the minutes of the planning commission and the board of commissioners, as the case may be, with the reasons for which the departure was justified, and the conditions under which the variance was granted.
  So noted.



Variance

Property Information	
Tax Map/Parcel ID	Tax Map 068 Parcel 1670
Address/Location	4019 Gateway Boulevard
Acreage (+/-)	1.927 +/- acres
Current Zoning	C-2 (General Commercial)
Existing Use	Commercial (Under Construction)
Request	Variance to Section 90-135 Signs
Commission District	District 4 (Morris)
Recommendation	Approval

## Summary and Recommendation

Owner Goodwill Industries and applicant John T. Rosson request a variance to Section 90-135 *Signs* for Tax Map 068 Parcel 1670, 1.927 +/- acres located at 4019 Gateway Boulevard, currently zoned C-2 (General Commercial) to permit an additional wall sign and to increase the permitted square footage of proposed signage.

The subject property and adjacent properties are zoned C-2 General Commercial.

The applicant requests a variance to Section 90-135 *Signs* to permit an additional wall sign and to increase the permitted square footage of proposed signage. The applicant originally submitted an application to Building Standards for just over 335 square feet of signage. This was well over the permitted 7% of wall area (in this case 211 square feet) permitted by code in the Community Sign Overlay District. In addition, the original application included three wall signs and code only permits two wall signs. The applicant worked with staff to decrease the size of a portion of the signage so that the owner could move forward with at least some of the signage for their opening and have the remaining wall sign as a part of this variance.

The applicant has provided the rationale that the additional signage will make the business more visible from the intersection of Horizon South Parkway and Gateway Boulevard, as well as consistency with all other new construction locations. Overall, staff is comfortable with the request. The additional signage and square footage has a minimal impact, if at all, on adjacent properties. The additional forty-four square feet of signage is a reasonable request due to the size of the structure and its surroundings. In addition, the applicant made a good faith effort to reduce the size of the other proposed signage.



Variance

Staff recommends **approval** of the variance to Section 90-135 *Signs* for Tax Map 068 Parcel 1670, 1.927 +/- acres located at 4019 Gateway Boulevard, currently zoned C-2 (General Commercial) to permit an additional wall sign and to increase permitted square footage of proposed wall signs as submitted.

## Interdepartmental Review

A copy of this staff report, including a list of all recommended zoning conditions, is sent to the applicant and owner of the property in question prior to the public hearing.

### Comments:

### **Building Standards:**

Ensure all applicable codes provided by the International Building Code and the National Electrical Code are met.

#### Fire Marshal:

To comply with applicable fire codes.

### Planning:

Conditions supplement but do not eliminate other code requirements which pertain to site development. No additional variances from code have been expressed or implied. In case of conflicts, the more restrictive item shall prevail over the less restrictive item.

## Criteria for Evaluation of Variance Proposal

- 1. There are special circumstances or conditions unique to the property that do not generally apply to the district.
  - The property does not exhibit any conditions that are different from adjacent property. The building is larger than the adjacent properties to the east and west, but that is the only difference.
- 2. The special circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the applicant of any reasonable use of his land. Mere loss in value shall not justify a variance. There must be a deprivation of beneficial use of land.
  - The property could still be used, but the signage would be limited to what is permitted by code.
- 3. Topographical or other conditions peculiar and particular to the site are such that strict adherence to the requirements of this chapter would cause the owner unnecessary hardship, and would not carry out the intent of this chapter, and that there is no feasible alternative to remedy the situation.



**COLUMBIA COUNTY** 

FILE: VA16-05-03

Variance

Again, the signage would be limited to what is permitted by code and the applicant has requested relief from that provision.

4. If granted, the variance shall be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this chapter, and shall not be injurious to the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

The variance would not be injurious to the neighborhood, nor detrimental to the public welfare.

- 5. In reviewing an application for a variance, the burden of showing that the variance should be recommended and/or granted shall be upon the person applying for the variance.
  - In staff's opinion the applicant has provided minimal justification for the variance.
- 6. When recommending a variance, the planning commission, or board of commissioners, when granting a variance, may establish reasonable conditions concerning the use of the property, and may establish an expiration date for such variances.

  So noted.
- 7. Any variance recommended and/or authorized is to be set forth in writing in the minutes of the planning commission and the board of commissioners, as the case may be, with the reasons for which the departure was justified, and the conditions under which the variance was granted.
  So noted.



# **VARIANCE**



FILE: VA16-05-04

Variance

Property Information	
Tax Map/Parcel ID	Tax Map 072 Parcel 045F
Address/Location	4355 Washington Road
Acreage (+/-)	8.63 +/- acres
Current Zoning	C-2 (General Commercial)
Existing Use	Commercial
Request	Variance from Section 90-135 Signs
Commission District	District 1 (Duncan)
Recommendation	Approval

## **Executive Summary:**

Applicant John Roegge and owner Westwood Financial Corp. request a variance from Section 90-135 *Signs* for the 8.63 +/- acre parcel (Tax Map 072 Parcel 045F) located at 4355 Washington Road to permit additional wall signage and a larger freestanding sign for the development.

The parcel in question is located on the northeast side of Washington Road in the Evans Town Center Overlay District. Surrounding properties are all zoned C-2 (General Commercial).

The Kroger store on the property is being expanded and refaced; the expansion requires that the entire property be brought into compliance with existing County code requirements as per Section 90-132. The existing signage on the property does not comply with existing requirements. The applicants intend to retain the same signage after the expansion of the building and are requesting variances to permit them to do so.

There are two parts to this variance request, the first concerning the freestanding sign and the second concerning the wall signage.

This property is considered a planned center, therefore their freestanding sign is permitted to be 20 feet tall with 120 square feet of sign face area. Their current sign is 25 feet tall and includes just under 180 square feet of sign face area. The existing sign will be relocated to accommodate a new traffic light and some changes will be made to the size of the individual panels, but the overall sign is intended to remain the same.

The second part of the variance is for the number of wall signs permitted on the building; this is a single frontage parcel, and there are multiple tenants in the building, therefore a total of two wall signs is permitted under the Code. The proposed sign package includes three signs for Kroger, consisting

# **VARIANCE**



FILE: VA16-05-04

Variance

of an Rx sign for the pharmacy, a Kroger oval on the opposite end of the store frontage, and the full Kroger food and pharmacy signage over the main entrance. There are two additional signs proposed for Starbucks and Western Union. Although the number of signs exceeds that allowed by Code, the total square footage of the signs is just over 300 square feet and is less than the 6% of the building elevation permitted by the Code.

Given the scale of the property and the building, staff feels that the request for additional signage is reasonable. Additionally, the majority of the proposed signs are already in place on the parcel and only require a variance to satisfy Section 90-132. These signs have not caused any detriment to the public welfare.

Staff recommends **approval** of the request for a variance from Section 90-135 *Signs* for the 8.63 +/-acre parcel (Tax Map 072 Parcel 045F) located at 4355 Washington Road to permit additional wall signage and a larger freestanding sign for the development.

## Interdepartmental Review

A copy of this staff report, including a list of all recommended zoning conditions, is sent to the applicant and owner of the property in question prior to the public hearing.

## Comments:

### **Building Standards:**

Ensure all applicable codes provided by the International Building Code and the National Electrical Code are met.

#### Fire Marshal:

To comply with applicable fire codes.

#### Planning:

No additional variances have been expressed or implied. In case of conflicts, the more restrictive item shall prevail.



FILE: VA16-05-04

Variance

## Criteria for Evaluation of Variance Proposal:

- 1. There are special circumstances or conditions unique to the property that do not generally apply to the district.
  - There are no special circumstances or conditions unique to this property.
- 2. The special circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the applicant of any reasonable use of his land. Mere loss in value shall not justify a variance. There must be a deprivation of beneficial use of land.
  - Strict application would not deprive the applicant of the intended use of the land.
- 3. Topographical or other conditions peculiar and particular to the site are such that strict adherence to the requirements of this chapter would cause the owner unnecessary hardship, and would not carry out the intent of this chapter, and that there is no feasible alternative to remedy the situation.
  - There are no conditions peculiar to this site that prevent strict application of the sign code. However, the intent of the Code is to avoid sign clutter, and given the size of the parcel and scale of the building, the requested signage is reasonable.
- 4. If granted, the variance shall be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this chapter, and shall not be injurious to the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.
  - The proposal would not be physically injurious to the neighborhood.
- 5. In reviewing an application for a variance, the burden of showing that the variance should be recommended and/or granted shall be upon the person applying for the variance.
  - The applicant has met this burden.
- 6. When recommending a variance, the planning commission, or board of commissioners, when granting a variance, may establish reasonable conditions concerning the use of the property, and may establish an expiration date for such variances.

  So noted.
- 7. Any variance recommended and/or authorized is to be set forth in writing in the minutes of the planning commission and the board of commissioners, as the case may be, with the reasons for which the departure was justified, and the conditions under which the variance was granted.
  So noted.



## TEXT AMENDMENT

TA16-04-08

Text Amendment Information	
Chapter	Chapter 90, Zoning, Article IV, Supplemental Requirements
Amendment	Section 90-147 List of Permitted Uses
Date Initiated by Planning Commission	April 21, 2016
Ordinance Number	16-15
DAB Recommendation	N/A
Staff Recommendation	Approval

## Summary and Recommendation

The proposal would adopt a new section of the zoning ordinance, Section 90-147 *Use provisions*. Section 90-147 provides definitions and use standards for land uses enumerated by the lists of allowed uses in Section 90-50 and Section 90-97.





## TEXT AMENDMENT

TA16-04-02

Text Amendment Information	
Chapter	Chapter 90, Zoning, Article II, Residential Districts
Amendment	Section 90-50 List of Permitted Uses
Date Initiated by Planning Commission	April 21, 2016
Ordinance Number	16-14
DAB Recommendation	N/A
Staff Recommendation	Approval

# Summary and Recommendation

The proposed revision to Section 90-50, which is the residential permitted uses table, revises the format and renames the section to the List of Allowed Uses.

Uses are either Allowed (A), Limited (L), or Conditional (C). If a use is Allowed, it is allowed in the zoning district by right. If a use is Limited, it is allowed in the zoning district, subject to a use standard listed in the right-hand column of the table (which references Section 90-147 *Use provisions*). If a use is Conditional, it may be allowed in the respective district, subject to approval by the Board of Commissioners. Blank cells indicate that a use is not allowed in the respective district.

The proposed revision works in conjunction with Ordinances 16-13 and 16-15 to revise all permitted uses tables, definitions, and use standards.



## TEXT AMENDMENT

TA16-04-03

Text Amendment Information	
Chapter	Chapter 90, Zoning, Article III, Commercial, Industrial, Professional, Special, Planned Unit Development and Planned Development Districts
Amendment	Section 90-97 List of Permitted Uses
Date Initiated by Planning Commission	April 21, 2016
Ordinance Number	16-13
DAB Recommendation	N/A
Staff Recommendation	Approval

## Summary and Recommendation

The proposed revision to Section 90-97, which is the commercial permitted uses table, revises the format and renames the section to the List of Allowed Uses.

Uses are either Allowed (A), Limited (L), or Conditional (C). If a use is Allowed, it is allowed in the zoning district by right. If a use is Limited, it is allowed in the zoning district, subject to a use standard listed in the right-hand column of the table (which references Section 90-147 *Use provisions*). If a use is Conditional, it may be allowed in the respective district, subject to approval by the Board of Commissioners. Blank cells indicate that a use is not allowed in the respective district.

The proposed revision works in conjunction with Ordinances 16-14 and 16-15 to revise all permitted uses tables, definitions, and use standards.